arXiv:1209.3454v1 [math.MG] 16 Sep 2012

# Polygonal equalities in Hilbert spaces

Anthony Weston

Abstract. Cases of equality in the classical 2-negative type inequalities for Hilbert spaces are characterized in terms of balanced signed $(s+t)$-simplices. It follows that a finite metric subspace $\{z_0, z_1, \ldots z_n\}$ of a real or complex Hilbert space $H$ has strict 2-negative type if and only if the set $\{z_1 - z_0, z_2 - z_0, \ldots, z_n - z_0\}$ is linearly independent (when $H$ is considered as a real vector space). By way of application, we deduce that no metric space of strict 2-negative type is isometric to any affinely dependent metric subspace of any Hilbert space $H$ (when $H$ is considered as a real vector space). This leads to a complete description of the class $\mathcal{M}$ introduced by Shkarin in [16].

## 1. Introduction

This paper is written as a companion to Kelleher *et al.* [6]. For each $p$ in the range $(0, 2)$, the main result in [6] characterizes the metric subspaces of $L_p(\Omega, \mu)$ that have strict $p$-negative type. The case $p = 2$ is left open in [6]. In this paper we characterize the metric subspaces of $L_2(\Omega, \mu)$ that have strict 2-negative type. The characterization for Hilbert spaces is substantially different to that of $L_p$-spaces for $0 < p < 2$ and follows from Theorem 3.2: Given points $x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_t$ in $L_2(\Omega, \mu)$ and real numbers $m_1, \ldots, m_s, n_1, \ldots, n_t$ such that $m_1 + \cdots + m_s = n_1 + \cdots + n_t$, the following conditions are equivalent:

(a) $$0 = \sum_{j,i=1}^{s,t} m_j n_i \|x_j - y_i\|_2^2 - \sum_{1 \le j_1 < j_2 \le s} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} \|x_{j_1} - x_{j_2}\|_2^2 - \sum_{1 \le i_1 < i_2 \le t} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} \|y_{i_1} - y_{i_2}\|_2^2.$$

(b) $$\sum_j m_j x_j(\omega) = \sum_i n_i y_i(\omega) \text{ for almost all } \omega \in \Omega.$$

(c) $$\sum_j m_j x_j = \sum_i n_i y_i.$$

Throughout the paper we use $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ to denote the set of all natural numbers. Whenever sums are indexed over the empty set they are defined to be 0. All measures are non-trivial and positive.

## 2. Negative Type

The notion of negative type was introduced and studied by Menger [10] and Schoenberg [13, 14, 15]. Menger and Schoenberg were interested in determining which metric spaces can be isometrically embedded into a Hilbert space. More recently, there has been interest in the notion of "strict" $p$-negative type, particularly as it pertains to the geometry of finite metric spaces. Papers that have been instrumental in developing properties of metrics of strict $p$-negative type include [4, 5, 2, 9, 17, 12, 6].

**Definition** 2.1. Let $p \ge 0$ and let $(X, d)$ be a metric space.

(1) $(X, d)$ has *$p$-negative type* if and only if for all finite subsets $\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\} \subseteq X$ $(n \ge 2)$ and all choices of real numbers $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$ with $\eta_1 + \cdots + \eta_n = 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{j,i=1}^{n} d(z_j, z_i)^p \eta_j \eta_i \quad \le \quad 0. \tag{2.1}$$

(2) $(X, d)$ has *strict $p$-negative type* if and only if it has $p$-negative type and the inequality (2.1) is strict whenever the scalar $n$-tuple $(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n) \ne (0, \ldots, 0)$.

The following fundamental fact is due to Schoenberg [15].

**Theorem** 2.2. *Let $0 < p \leq 2$ and suppose that $(\Omega, \mu)$ is a measure space. Then $L_p(\Omega, \mu)$ has $p$-negative type but it does not have $q$-negative type for any $q > p$.*

By way of comparison, if $2 < p \leq \infty$ and $L_p(\Omega, \mu)$ is of dimension at least 3, then $L_p(\Omega, \mu)$ does not have $q$-negative type for any $q > 0$. This follows from theorems of Dor [1], Misiewicz [11] and Koldobsky [7].

In order to address cases of equality in (2.1) it is helpful to reformulate Definition 2.1 in terms of signed $(s+t)$-simplices and the corresponding $p$-simplex "gaps", the notions of which we now introduce.

**Definition** 2.3. Let $X$ be a set and suppose that $s, t > 0$ are integers. A *signed $(s+t)$-simplex in $X$* is a collection of (not necessarily distinct) points $x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_t \in X$ together with a corresponding collection of real numbers $m_1, \ldots, m_s, n_1, \ldots, n_t$ that satisfy $m_1 + \cdots + m_s = n_1 + \cdots + n_t$. Such a configuration of points and real numbers will be denoted by $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ and will simply be called a *simplex* when no confusion can arise.

The following definition is motivated by the notion of generalized roundness that was introduced by Enflo [3] in order to study a problem of Smirnov.

**Definition** 2.4. Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space and suppose that $p$ is a non-negative real number. For each signed $(s+t)$-simplex $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ in $X$ we define

$$\gamma_p(D) = \sum_{j,i=1}^{s,t} m_j n_i d(x_j, y_i)^p - \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq s} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} d(x_{j_1}, x_{j_2})^p - \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq t} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} d(y_{i_1}, y_{i_2})^p.$$

We call $\gamma_p(D)$ the *$p$-simplex gap of $D$ in* $(X, d)$.

In the formulation of Definition 2.3 the points $x_1, \ldots, x_s, y_1, \ldots, y_t \in X$ are not required to be distinct. As we will see, this allows a high degree of flexibility but it also comes at some technical cost, the most important of which is the necessity of keeping track of repetitions using repeating numbers.

**Definition** 2.5. Given a signed $(s+t)$-simplex $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ in a set $X$ we denote by $S(D)$ the set of distinct points in $X$ that appear in $D$. In other words,

$$S(D) = \{z \in X : z = x_j \text{ for some } j \text{ or } z = y_i \text{ for some } i\}.$$

For each $z \in S(D)$ we define the *repeating numbers* $\mathbf{m}(z)$ and $\mathbf{n}(z)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(z) &= \sum_{j : z = x_j} m_j, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{n}(z) &= \sum_{i : z = y_i} n_i. \end{aligned}$$

We say that the simplex $D$ is *degenerate* if $\mathbf{m}(z) = \mathbf{n}(z)$ for all $z \in S(D)$.

There are various ways that we may refine a signed $(s+t)$-simplex $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ in a metric space $(X, d)$ without altering any of the values of the $p$-simplex gaps $\gamma_p(D)$, $p > 0$. The following lemmas describe three such scenarios. The first lemma is particularly simple and is stated without proof.

**Lemma** 2.6 (**Procedure 1**). *Suppose that $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in a metric space $(X, d)$ with the property that $x_1 = x_2$. Let $D^\sharp = [x_2(m_1 + m_2), x_3(m_3), \ldots, x_s(m_s); y_i(n_i)]_{s-1,t}$. Then $\gamma_p(D) = \gamma_p(D^\sharp)$ for all $p > 0$. Moreover, $S(D) = S(D^\sharp)$, and all repeating numbers are invariant under this refinement.*

**Lemma** 2.7 (**Procedure 2**). *Suppose that $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in a metric space $(X, d)$ with the property that $x_1 = y_1$. Let $D^* = [x_1(0), x_2(m_2), \ldots, x_s(m_s); y_1(n_1 - m_1), y_2(n_2), \ldots, y_t(n_t)]_{s,t}$. Then $\gamma_p(D) = \gamma_p(D^*)$ for all $p > 0$. Moreover, as $x_1 = y_1 = z$ for some $z \in S(D) (= S(D^*))$, it is also the case that $\mathbf{m}_{D^*}(z) = \mathbf{m}_D(z) - m_1$ and $\mathbf{n}_{D^*}(z) = \mathbf{n}_D(z) - m_1$.*

Proof. Let $p \geq 0$ be given. The assumption is that $x_1 = y_1$. Let $\gamma_p(D)(x_1)$ denote the contribution of the $x_1$-terms to the $p$-simplex gap $\gamma_p(D)$. Similarly, let $\gamma_p(D)(y_1)$ and $\gamma_p(D^*)(y_1)$ denote the contribution of the $y_1$-terms to $\gamma_p(D)$ and $\gamma_p(D^*)$, respectively. It suffices to show that $\gamma_p(D)(x_1)+\gamma_p(D)(y_1) = \gamma_p(D^*)(y_1)$. (This just says that "$x_1(m_1)$" cancels "$y_1(m_1)$" in $\gamma_p(D)$, leaving $\gamma_p(D^*)$.) First of all, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_p(D)(x_1) &= m_1\left(\sum_{i=2}^{t} n_i d(x_1,y_i)^p\right) - m_1\left(\sum_{j=2}^{s} m_j d(x_1,x_j)^p\right)\\
&= m_1\left(\sum_{i=2}^{t} n_i d(y_1,y_i)^p\right) - m_1\left(\sum_{j=2}^{s} m_j d(x_1,x_j)^p\right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_p(D)(y_1) &= (n_1-m_1+m_1)\left(\sum_{j=2}^{s} m_j d(x_j,y_1)^p\right) - (n_1-m_1+m_1)\left(\sum_{i=2}^{t} n_i d(y_1,y_i)^p\right)\\
&= (n_1-m_1)\left(\sum_{j=2}^{s} m_j d(x_j,y_1)^p\right) - (n_1-m_1)\left(\sum_{i=2}^{t} n_i d(y_1,y_i)^p\right)\\
&\quad + m_1\left(\sum_{j=2}^{s} m_j d(x_j,y_1)^p\right) - m_1\left(\sum_{i=2}^{t} n_i d(y_1,y_i)^p\right)\\
&= \gamma_p(D^*)(y_1) - \gamma_p(D)(x_1).
\end{aligned}$$

The second assertion of the lemma is true by construction. □

**Notation.** The refinement procedure used to form the simplex $D^*$ in the statement of Lemma 2.7 will be denoted: $x_1(m_1) \to x_1(0), y_1(n_1) \to y_1(n_1-m_1)$. This notation will be used in the proof of Lemma 2.16.

There is a useful variant of the second refinement procedure.

**Lemma** 2.8 (**Procedure 3**). *Suppose that* $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ *is a signed* $(s+t)$*-simplex in a metric space* $(X,d)$*. Let* $y_{t+1} = x_1$*,* $n_{t+1} = -m_1$ *and* $D^* = [x_1(0), x_2(m_2), \ldots, x_s(m_s); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t+1}$*. Then* $\gamma_p(D) = \gamma_p(D^*)$ *for all* $p > 0$*. Moreover, as* $x_1 = y_{t+1} = z$ *for some* $z \in S(D)(= S(D^*))$*, it is also the case that* $\mathbf{m}_{D^*}(z) = \mathbf{m}_D(z) - m_1$ *and* $\mathbf{n}_{D^*}(z) = \mathbf{n}_D(z) - m_1$*.*

Proof. If we set $y_{t+1} = x_1$, then we may insert the pair $y_{t+1}(0)$ into the simplex $D$ without altering any of the simplex gaps or repeating numbers. Now apply Lemma 2 to refine the simplex $D$ in the following way: $x_1(m_1) \to x_1(0), y_{t+1}(0) \to y_{t+1}(-m_1)$. □

**Notation.** The refinement procedure used to form the simplex $D^*$ in the statement of Lemma 2.8 will be denoted: $x_1(m_1) \to x_1(0), y_{t+1}(n_{t+1}) = x_1(-m_1)$. This notation will be used in the proof of Lemma 2.16.

We use the three refinement procedures described in Lemma 2.6 – 2.8 to formulate a notion of equivalent simplices.

**Definition** 2.9. Two simplices $D_1$ and $D_2$ in a metric space $(X,d)$ are said to be *equivalent* if $D_2$ can be obtained from $D_1$ by finitely many applications of the refinement procedures. If simplices $D_1$ and $D_2$ are equivalent we write $D_1 \sim D_2$.

Remark 2.10. Notice that if $D_1 \sim D_2$, then:

(1) $S(D_1) = S(D_2)$,
(2) for each $z \in S(D_1) = S(D_2)$, $\mathbf{m}_{D_1}(z) = \mathbf{n}_{D_1}(z)$ if and only if $\mathbf{m}_{D_2}(z) = \mathbf{n}_{D_2}(z)$, and
(3) $\gamma_p(D_1) = \gamma_p(D_2)$ for all $p > 0$.

The notion of equivalent simplices affords an important characterization of degeneracy.

**Lemma** 2.11. *A signed* $(s+t)$*-simplex* $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ *in a metric space* $(X,d)$ *is degenerate if and only if it is equivalent to a signed simplex* $D_\varnothing$ *that has no non-zero weights.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose that $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a given degenerate simplex. We may assume, by applying Lemma 2.6 finitely often if necessary, that the degenerate simplex $D$ is full. (This forces $s = t$.) Let $z \in S(D)$ be given. By assumption, $\mathbf{m}_D(z) = \mathbf{n}_D(z)$. By relabeling the simplex, if necessary, we may assume that $z = x_1 = y_1$. As $D$ is full, $m_1 = \mathbf{m}_D(z) = \mathbf{n}_D(z) = n_1$. By Lemma 2.7, we see that $D$ is equivalent to the simplex $D^* = [x_1(0), x_2(m_2), \ldots, x_s(m_s); y_1(0), y_2(n_2), \ldots, y_t(n_t)]_{s,t}$. The forward implication of the lemma follows by applying this process a finite number of times.

($\Leftarrow$) Immediate from Remark 2.10. $\square$

As an immediate application of Lemma 2.11 we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY 2.12. *If $D$ is a degenerate simplex in a metric space $(X, d)$, then $\gamma_p(D) = 0$ for all $p > 0$.*

At this point it is helpful to introduce some additional descriptive terminology for simplices.

**Definition** 2.13. Let $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ be a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in a set $X$.

(a) $D$ is said to be *pure* if $\{x_j : 1 \leq j \leq s\} \cap \{y_i : 1 \leq i \leq t\} = \emptyset$.
(b) $D$ is said to be *full* if the points $x_1, \ldots, x_s \in X$ are pairwise distinct and the points $y_1, \ldots, y_t \in X$ are pairwise distinct.
(c) $D$ is *completely refined* if it is full, pure and has no non-positive weights.

In the case of vector spaces we will have reason to consider balanced simplices.

**Definition** 2.14. Let $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ be a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in a vector space $X$. We say that $D$ is *balanced* if

$$\sum_j m_j x_j = \sum_i n_i y_i.$$

Notice that if $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a degenerate simplex in a vector space $X$, then $D$ is automatically balanced.

**Lemma** 2.15. *Let $D_1$ and $D_2$ be simplices in a vector space $X$. If $D_1$ is balanced and if $D_1 \sim D_2$, then $D_2$ is balanced. (Any refinement of a balanced simplex is balanced.)*

PROOF. Immediate on the basis of the definitions. $\square$

The following lemma presents a fundamental dichotomy for a simplex in a metric space.

**Lemma** 2.16. *If $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in a metric space $(X, d)$, then exactly one of the following two statements must hold:*

(a) *$D$ is degenerate.*
(b) *$D$ is equivalent to a completely refined simplex $D^{***}$.*

PROOF. Let $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ be a given signed $(s+t)$-simplex in $(X, d)$. Finitely many applications of Lemma 2.6 will produce a full simplex $D^\sharp$ that is equivalent to $D$, satisfies $S(D) = S(D^\sharp)$ and has identical repeating numbers to $D$. So we may as well assume from the outset that the given simplex $D$ is full. There are five ways that we may then choose to refine the full simplex $D$ to produce an equivalent simplex $D^*$:

If $x_j = y_i$ for some $j, i$, then Lemma 2.7 allows us to form an equivalent simplex $D^*$ by implementing the appropriate refinement from the following list:

(1) If $m_j = n_i$: $x_j(m_j) \to x_j(0), y_i(n_i) \to y_i(0)$.
(2) If $m_j < n_i$: $x_j(m_j) \to x_j(0), y_i(n_i) \to y_i(n_i - m_j)$.
(3) If $m_j > n_i$: $x_j(m_j) \to x_j(m_j - n_i), y_i(n_i) \to y_i(0)$.

If there is a $j$ such that $x_j \neq y_i$ for all $i$ and $m_j < 0$, then Lemma 2.8 allows us to form an equivalent simplex $D^*$ by implementing the following refinement:

(4) $x_j(m_j) \to x_j(0), y_{t+1}(n_{t+1}) = x_j(-m_j)$.

If there is a $i$ such that $y_i \neq x_j$ for all $j$ and $n_i < 0$, then Lemma 2.8 allows us to form an equivalent simplex $D^*$ by implementing the following refinement:

(5) $x_{s+1}(m_{s+1}) = y_i(-n_i), y_i(n_i) \to y_i(0)$.

Now implement the succession of all such possible refinements (1) – (3) (in any order) followed by the succession of all such possible refinements (4) – (5) (in any order) to produce a simplex $D^{**}$ that is equivalent to $D$. By construction, each vertex in the simplex $D^{**}$ has non-negative weight. Moreover, $D$ is degenerate if all vertices in $D^{**}$ have weight 0. On the other hand, $D$ is non-degenerate if at least one vertex in $D^{**}$ has positive weight. In the latter case, by deleting all vertices from $D^{**}$ that have weight 0, it follows that $D$ is equivalent to a completely refined simplex $D^{***}$. $\square$

The following theorem is a variation on a well-known theme. The proof is included for completeness.

**Theorem** 2.17. *Let $p \geq 0$ and let $(X, d)$ be a metric space. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *$(X, d)$ has $p$-negative type.*
(b) *$\gamma_p(D) \geq 0$ for each signed simplex $D$ in $X$.*

*Moreover, $(X, d)$ has strict $p$-negative type if and only if $\gamma_p(D) > 0$ for each non-degenerate signed simplex $D$ in $(X, d)$.*

Proof. *(a)* $\Rightarrow$ *(b)*. Suppose (a) holds. Let $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ be a given signed $(s+t)$-simplex in $X$. If $D$ is degenerate, then $\gamma_p(D) = 0$ by Corollary 2.12. Assume $D$ is non-degenerate. By Lemma 2.16, we may further assume that $D$ is completely refined. Let $n = s+t$. For $1 \leq j \leq s$, set $z_j = x_j$ and $\eta_j = m_j$. For $1 \leq i \leq t$, set $z_{s+i} = y_i$ and $\eta_{s+i} = -n_i$. Since $m_1 + \cdots + m_s = n_1 + \cdots + n_t$, we see that $\eta_1 + \cdots + \eta_n = 0$. Moreover, $\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$ is a subset of $X$ (no repetitions) and each $\eta_k \neq 0$ because the simplex $D$ is completely refined. It is then a relatively simple matter to check that

$$\sum_{j,i} d(z_j, z_i)^p \eta_j \eta_i \quad = \quad -2 \cdot \gamma_p(D). \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore $\gamma_p(D) \geq 0$. Moreover, $\gamma_p(D) > 0$ if $(X, d)$ has strict $p$-negative type.

*(b)* $\Rightarrow$ *(a)*. Suppose (b) holds. Let $\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$ be a given non-empty finite subset of $X$. Let $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$ be a given collection of real numbers that satisfy $\eta_1 + \cdots + \eta_n = 0$. To avoid a triviality, we may assume that not all of the $\eta_k$'s are 0. (This forces $n \geq 2$.) By relabeling $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ (if necessary) we may choose integers $s, t > 0$ such that $s + t = n$, $\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_s \geq 0$ and $\eta_{s+1}, \eta_{s+2}, \ldots, \eta_n < 0$. Notice that $\eta_1 + \cdots + \eta_s = -(\eta_{s+1} + \cdots + \eta_n) > 0$. Now set $x_j = z_j$ and $m_j = \eta_j$ for all $j$, $1 \leq j \leq s$. Similarly, set $y_i = z_{s+i}$ and $n_i = -\eta_{s+i}$ for all $i$, $1 \leq i \leq t$. By construction, $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a non-degenerate signed $(s+t)$-simplex in $X$. By assumption, $\gamma_p(D) \geq 0$. However, the $p$-simplex gap of $D$ also satisfies (2.2), thus:

$$\sum_{j,i} d(z_j, z_i)^p \eta_j \eta_i \quad \leq \quad 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, if the inequality in (b) is strict for each non-degenerate signed simplex in $X$, then the inequality (2.3) will be strict. □

We are now in a position to rigorously formulate the notion of a non-trivial $p$-polygonal equality.

**Definition** 2.18. Let $p$ be a non-negative real number. A *$p$-polygonal equality in a metric space* $(X, d)$ is an equality of the form $\gamma_p(D) = 0$ where $D$ is a simplex in $X$. If, moreover, the underlying simplex $D$ is non-degenerate, we will say that the $p$-polygonal equality is *non-trivial*.

The motivation for making Definition 2.18 is patently clear from Theorem 2.17. In fact, Theorem 2.17 automatically implies the following useful lemma.

**Lemma** 2.19. *Let $p > 0$ and let $(X, d)$ be a metric space that has $p$-negative type. Then $(X, d)$ has strict $p$-negative type if and only if it admits no non-trivial $p$-polygonal equality.*

Lemma 2.19 is noted in [**6**]. The following two results also appear in [**6**]. The proofs are included here because they are instructive, short and relevant.

**Lemma** 2.20. *Let $p > 0$. If a metric space $(X, d)$ admits a non-trivial $p$-polygonal equality, then:*

(1) *$(X, d)$ does not have $q$-negative type for any $q > p$, and*
(2) *$(X, d)$ does not have strict $p$-negative type.*

Proof. Suppose $(X, d)$ admits a non-trivial $p$-polygonal equality for some $p > 0$. If we assume that $(X, d)$ has $q$-negative type for some $q > p$, then it must have strict $p$-negative type by Theorem 5.4 in Li and Weston [**9**]. However, this would contradict Lemma 2.19. □

Lemma 2.20 implies the following natural isometric embedding principle.

**Theorem** 2.21. *Let $(Y, \rho)$ be a metric space whose supremal $p$-negative type $\wp$ is finite. Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space that has $q$-negative type for some $q > \wp$. Then: $(X, d)$ is not isometric to any metric subspace of $(Y, \rho)$ that admits a non-trivial $p_1$-polygonal equality for some $p_1$ such that $\wp \leq p_1 < q$.*

PROOF. Let $Z \subseteq Y$. Suppose that $(Z, \rho)$ admits a non-trivial $p_1$-polygonal equality for some $p_1 \in [\wp, q)$. By Lemma 2.20, the supremal $p$-negative type of $(Z, \rho)$ cannot exceed $p_1$. On the other hand, the supremal $p$-negative type of $(X, d)$ is at least $q$. As $q > p_1$, we conclude that $(X, d)$ is not isometric to $(Z, \rho)$. $\square$

## 3. Polygonal equalities in Hilbert spaces

The following lemma is of central importance to understanding 2-polygonal equalities in Hilbert spaces.

**Lemma** 3.1. *Let $s, t > 0$ be integers. If $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in the real line or complex plane (endowed with the usual metric), then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_j m_j x_j - \sum_i n_i y_i \right|^2 &= \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i |x_j - y_i|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} |x_{j_1} - x_{j_2}|^2 - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} |y_{i_1} - y_{i_2}|^2 \\
&= \gamma_2(D) \qquad (3.1)
\end{aligned}$$

*Moreover, if $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in the real line or complex plane, then*

$$0 = \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i |x_j - y_i|^2 - \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} |x_{j_1} - x_{j_2}|^2 - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} |y_{i_1} - y_{i_2}|^2 \qquad (3.2)$$

*if and only if $\sum\limits_j m_j x_j = \sum\limits_i n_i y_i$.*

PROOF. Let $L$ and $R$ denote the left and right sides of (5.1), respectively. We prove that $L = R$ by reduction to an equality that involves only real quantities. The first thing to notice is that

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \left( \sum_j m_j x_j - \sum_i n_i y_i \right) \left( \sum_j m_j \overline{x}_j - \sum_i n_i \overline{y}_i \right) \\
&= \left( \sum_j m_j x_j \right) \left( \sum_j m_j \overline{x}_j \right) - \left( \sum_j m_j x_j \right) \left( \sum_i n_i \overline{y}_i \right) \\
&\quad - \left( \sum_i n_i y_i \right) \left( \sum_j m_j \overline{x}_j \right) + \left( \sum_i n_i y_i \right) \left( \sum_i n_i \overline{y}_i \right) \\
\therefore L &= m_1^2 |x_1|^2 + \cdots + m_s^2 |x_s|^2 + \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} x_{j_1} \overline{x}_{j_2} + \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} \overline{x}_{j_1} x_{j_2} \\
&\quad - \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i x_j \overline{y}_i - \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i \overline{x}_j y_i \\
&\quad + n_1^2 |y_1|^2 + \cdots + n_t^2 |y_t|^2 + \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} y_{i_1} \overline{y}_{i_2} + \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} \overline{y}_{i_1} y_{i_2}. \qquad (3.3)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i (x_j - y_i)(\overline{x}_j - \overline{y}_i) - \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} (x_{j_1} - x_{j_2})(\overline{x}_{j_1} - \overline{x}_{j_2}) - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} (y_{i_1} - y_{i_2})(\overline{y}_{i_1} - \overline{y}_{i_2}) \\
\therefore R &= \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i |x_j|^2 + \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i |y_i|^2 - \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i x_j \overline{y}_i - \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i \overline{x}_j y_i \\
&\quad - \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} \left( |x_{j_1}|^2 + |x_{j_2}|^2 \right) + \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} x_{j_1} \overline{x}_{j_2} + \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} \overline{x}_{j_1} x_{j_2} \\
&\quad - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} \left( |y_{i_1}|^2 + |y_{i_2}|^2 \right) + \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} y_{i_1} \overline{y}_{i_2} + \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} \overline{y}_{i_1} y_{i_2}. \qquad (3.4)
\end{aligned}$$

By comparing the expressions (3.3) and (3.4) for $L$ and $R$ we see that the proof will be complete if we can establish the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2|x_1|^2+\cdots+m_s^2|x_s|^2+n_1^2|y_1|^2+\cdots+n_t^2|y_t|^2 &= \sum_{j,i} m_jn_i|x_j|^2+\sum_{j,i} m_jn_i|y_i|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{j_1<j_2} m_{j_1}m_{j_2}\left(|x_{j_1}|^2+|x_{j_2}|^2\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i_1<i_2} n_{i_1}n_{i_2}\left(|y_{i_1}|^2+|y_{i_2}|^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Now let $L^\sharp$ and $R^\sharp$ denote the left and right sides of (3.5). Recalling that $m_1+\cdots+m_s=n_1+\cdots+n_t$ we are now in a position to complete the proof. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} R^\sharp &= \left(n_1+\cdots+n_t\right)\left(m_1|x_1|^2+\cdots+m_s|x_s|^2\right)+\left(m_1+\cdots+m_s\right)\left(n_1|y_1|^2+\cdots+n_t|y_t|^2\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j_1<j_2} m_{j_1}m_{j_2}\left(|x_{j_1}|^2+|x_{j_2}|^2\right)- \sum_{i_1<i_2} n_{i_1}n_{i_2}\left(|y_{i_1}|^2+|y_{i_2}|^2\right) \\ &= \left(m_1+\cdots+m_s\right)\left(m_1|x_1|^2+\cdots+m_s|x_s|^2\right)+\left(n_1+\cdots+n_t\right)\left(n_1|y_1|^2+\cdots+n_t|y_t|^2\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j_1<j_2} m_{j_1}m_{j_2}\left(|x_{j_1}|^2+|x_{j_2}|^2\right)- \sum_{i_1<i_2} n_{i_1}n_{i_2}\left(|y_{i_1}|^2+|y_{i_2}|^2\right) \\ &= m_1^2|x_1|^2+\cdots+m_s^2|x_s|^2+n_1^2|y_1|^2+\cdots+n_t^2|y_t|^2 \\ &= L^\sharp. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem** 3.2. *Let $(\Omega,\mu)$ be a measure space. Let $D=[x_j(m_j);y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ be a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in $L_2(\Omega,\mu)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $\gamma_2(D)=0$.
(2) $\sum\limits_j m_jx_j(\omega)=\sum\limits_i n_iy_i(\omega)$ *for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$.*
(3) *$D$ is balanced.*

Proof. It suffices to assume that the scalar field of $L_2(\Omega,\mu)$ is the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $D=[x_j(m_j);y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a given signed $(s+t)$-simplex in $L_2(\Omega,\mu)$. Then $D(\omega)=[x_j(\omega)(m_j);y_i(\omega)(n_i)]_{s,t}$ is a signed $(s+t)$-simplex in the complex plane for each $\omega\in\Omega$. By Lemma 3.1 (5.1), we see that $\gamma_2(D(\omega))\geq 0$ for each $\omega\in\Omega$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2(D) &= \int\limits_\Omega \gamma_2(D(\omega))d\omega \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\gamma_2(D)=0$ if and only if $\gamma_2(D(\omega))=0$ $\mu$-a.e. on $\Omega$. (Otherwise we would have $\gamma_2(D)>0$.) However, given $\omega\in\Omega$, we have $\gamma_2(D(\omega))=0$ if and only if $\sum\limits_j m_jx_j(\omega)=\sum\limits_i n_iy_i(\omega)$, by Lemma 3.1 (5.2). This proves the equivalence of (1) and (2). The equivalence of (2) and (3) is trivial. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let $H$ be Hilbert space. A metric subspace $Z$ of $H$ has strict 2-negative type if and only if it does not admit any non-degenerate balanced simplices.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 2.19 and Theorem 3.2. □

Corollary 3.4. *Let $H$ be a Hilbert space. Let $n\geq 1$ be an integer. Then: A metric subspace $\{z_0,z_1,\dots z_n\}$ of $H$ has strict 2-negative type if and only if the set $\{z_1-z_0,z_2-z_0,\dots,z_n-z_0\}$ is linearly independent (when $H$ is considered as a real vector space).*

Proof. We argue both implications contrapositively.

Suppose that $Z=\{z_0,z_1,\dots z_n\}$ does not have strict 2-negative type. By Corollary 3.3, $Z$ must admit a non-degenerate balanced simplex $D=[x_j(m_j);y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$. By Lemma 2.15 and Lemma 2.16, we may assume that the simplex $D$ is completely refined. By definition, we have $\sum m_jx_j=\sum n_iy_i$ and $\sum m_j=\sum n_i$ with at least one (and, in fact, all) $m_j \neq 0$. By relabeling the elements of $Z$ (if necessary) we may assume that $x_1 = z_0$. Since $m_1 = (n_1 + \cdots + n_t) - (m_2 + \cdots + m_s)$, we see that

$$\big((n_1 + \cdots + n_t) - (m_2 + \cdots + m_s)\big)z_0 \quad = \quad \sum_i n_i y_i - \sum_{j \geq 2} m_j x_j .$$

In other words,

$$0 \quad = \quad \sum_i n_i(y_i - z_0) - \sum_{j \geq 2} m_j(x_j - z_0).$$

This shows that the set $\{z_1 - z_0, z_2 - z_0, \ldots, z_n - z_0\}$ has a non-empty linearly dependent subset. Hence the set $\{z_1 - z_0, z_2 - z_0, \ldots, z_n - z_0\}$ is linearly dependent.

Now suppose that the set $\{z_1 - z_0, z_2 - z_0, \ldots, z_n - z_0\}$ linearly dependent. Then there exist real numbers $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$, not all 0, such that $\alpha_1(z_1 - z_0) + \alpha_2(z_2 - z_0) + \cdots + \alpha_n(z_n - z_0) = 0$. Setting $\alpha_0 = -(\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n)$, so that $\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n = 0$, we see that $\alpha_0 z_0 + \alpha_1 z_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n z_n = 0$. As a result,

$$\sum_{j:\alpha_j > 0} \alpha_j z_j \quad = \quad \sum_{i:\alpha_i \leq 0} -\alpha_i z_i. \tag{3.6}$$

By construction,

$$\sum_{j:\alpha_j > 0} \alpha_j \quad = \quad \sum_{i:\alpha_i \leq 0} -\alpha_i, \tag{3.7}$$

and we have already stated that not all of the $\alpha$'s are 0. By discarding any $\alpha$'s that are equal to 0, we deduce from (3.6) and (3.7) that the set $Z = \{z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$ admits a non-degenerate balanced simplex $D$. (One half of the simplex $D$ is $\{z_j(\alpha_j) : \alpha_j > 0\}$ and the other half is $\{z_i(-\alpha_i) : \alpha_i < 0\}$.) Voilá, $Z$ does not have strict 2-negative type by Corollary 3.3. □

It is a fundamental result of Schoenberg [**13**] that every metric space of (strict) 2-negative type is isometric to a metric subspace of some real Hilbert space. Corollary 3.4 thus implies the following result.

Corollary 3.5. *A metric space has strict 2-negative type if and only if it is isometric to an affinely independent subset of some real Hilbert space. In particular, no metric space of strict 2-negative type is isometric to any affinely dependent metric subspace of any Hilbert space $H$ (when $H$ is considered as a real vector space).*

Proof. If $Z$ is an affinely dependent metric subspace of a Hilbert space $H$ (when $H$ is considered as a real vector space), then $Z$ does not have strict 2-negative type by Corollary 3.4. □

It is worth noting that the following theorem can easily be inferred from the proof of Corollary 3.4.

**Theorem** 3.6. *Let $X$ be a vector space. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. Then: A subset $\{z_0, z_1, \ldots z_n\}$ of $X$ admits a non-degenerate balanced simplex if and only if the set $\{z_1 - z_0, z_2 - z_0, \ldots, z_n - z_0\}$ linearly dependent (when $X$ is considered as a real vector space).*

## 4. Shkarin's class $\mathcal{M}$

In relation to a problem of Lemin [**8**] concerning the isometric embedding of ultrametric spaces into Banach spaces, Shkarin [**16**] introduced the class $\mathcal{M}$ of all finite metric spaces $(Z, d)$, $Z = \{z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$, which admit an isometric embedding $\phi : Z \to$ (real) $\ell_2$ such that the vectors $\{\phi(z_k) - \phi(z_0) : 1 \leq k \leq n\}$ are linearly independent. As noted by Shkarin, it follows from the work of Lemin (as well as several other authors), that the class $\mathcal{M}$ contains all finite ultrametric spaces. However, every finite metric space of (strict) 2-negative type admits an isometric embedding into real $\ell_2$ by Schoenberg [**13**]. Combining this result with Corollary 3.4 we obtain a complete description of Shkarin's class $\mathcal{M}$.

**Theorem** 4.1. *Shkarin's class $\mathcal{M}$ consists of all finite metric spaces of strict 2-negative type.*

## 5. Inner product spaces

The statement and proof of Lemma 3.1 may easily be adapted to inner product spaces. The outcome is the following generalization of Theorem 3.2.

**Theorem** 5.1. *Let* $(X, \langle \cdot \wr \cdot \rangle)$ *be a real or complex inner product space with induced norm* $\| \cdot \|$. *Let* $s, t > 0$ *be integers. If* $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ *is a signed* $(s+t)$*-simplex in* $X$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j m_j x_j - \sum_i n_i y_i \right\|^2 &= \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i \|x_j - y_i\|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} \|x_{j_1} - x_{j_2}\|^2 - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} \|y_{i_1} - y_{i_2}\|^2 \\ &= \gamma_2(D) \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

*Moreover, if* $D = [x_j(m_j); y_i(n_i)]_{s,t}$ *is a signed* $(s+t)$*-simplex in* $X$, *then*

$$0 = \sum_{j,i} m_j n_i \|x_j - y_i\|^2 - \sum_{j_1 < j_2} m_{j_1} m_{j_2} \|x_{j_1} - x_{j_2}\|^2 - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} n_{i_1} n_{i_2} \|y_{i_1} - y_{i_2}\|^2 \tag{5.2}$$

*if and only if* $\sum\limits_j m_j x_j = \sum\limits_i n_i y_i$.

The statement and proof of Corollary 3.4 may then be adapted to adapted to inner product spaces by appealing to Theorem 5.1. This leads to the final result of this paper.

Corollary 5.2. *Let* $H$ *be a real or complex inner product space. Let* $n \geq 1$ *be an integer. Then: A metric subspace* $\{z_0, z_1, \ldots z_n\}$ *of* $X$ *has strict* 2*-negative type if and only if the set* $\{z_1 - z_0, z_2 - z_0, \ldots, z_n - z_0\}$ *is linearly independent (when* $X$ *is considered as a real vector space).*

## References

[1] L. E. Dor, *Potentials and isometric embeddings in* $L_1$, Israel J. Math. **24** (1976), 260–268. 2

[2] I. Doust and A. Weston, *Enhanced negative type for finite metric trees*, J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), 2336–2364. 1

[3] P. Enflo, *On a problem of Smirnov*, Ark. Mat. **8** (1969), 107–109. 2

[4] P. Hjorth, P. Lisoněk, S. Markvorsen and C. Thomassen, *Finite metric spaces of strictly negative type*, Linear Algebra Appl. **270** (1998), 255–273. 1

[5] P. G. Hjorth, S. L. Kokkendorff and S. Markvorsen, *Hyperbolic spaces are of strictly negative type*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), 175–181. 1

[6] C. Kelleher, D. Miller, T. Osborn, A. Weston, *Polygonal equalities and virtual degeneracy in* $L_p$*-spaces*, arXiv:1203.5837v3. 1, 5

[7] A. Koldobsky, *Generalized Lévy representation of norms and isometric embeddings into* $L_p$*-spaces*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **28** (1992), 335–353. 2

[8] A. J. Lemin, *Isometric embedding of isosceles (non-Archimedean) spaces in Euclidean spaces*, Soviet Math. Dokl. **32** (3) (1985), 740–744. 8

[9] H. Li, A. Weston, *Strict* $p$*-negative type of a metric space*, Positivity **14** (2010), 529–545. 1, 5

[10] K. Menger, *Die Metrik des Hilbert-Raumes*, Akad. Wiss. Wien Abh. Math.-Natur. K1 **65** (1928), 159–160. 1

[11] J. Misiewicz, *Positive definite norm dependent functions on* $\ell^\infty$, Statist. Probab. Lett. **8** (1989), 255–260. 2

[12] S. Sánchez, *On the supremal* $p$*-negative type of a finite metric space*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **389** (2012), 98–107. 1

[13] I. J. Schoenberg, *Remarks to Maurice Frechet's article "Sur la définition axiomatique d'une classe d'espaces distanciés vectoriellement applicable sur l'espace de Hilbert."*, Ann. Math. **36** (1935), 724–732. 1, 8

[14] I. J. Schoenberg, *On certain metric spaces arising from Euclidean spaces by a change of metric and their imbedding in Hilbert space*, Ann. Math. **38** (1937), 787–793. 1

[15] I. J. Schoenberg, *Metric spaces and positive definite functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **44** (1938), 522–536. 1, 2

[16] S. A. Shkarin, *Isometric embedding of finite ultrametric spaces in Banach spaces*, Top. Appl. **142** (2004), 13–17. 1, 8

[17] R. Wolf, *On the gap of finite metric spaces of* $p$*-negative type*, Lin. Alg. Appl. **436** (2012), 1246–1257. 1

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Canisius College, Buffalo, NY 14208
*E-mail address*: `westona@canisius.edu`